

1 **LEVI & KORSINSKY, LLP**

2 Adam M. Apton (SBN 316506)  
3 Adam C. McCall (SBN 302130)  
4 75 Broadway, Suite 202  
5 San Francisco, CA 94111  
6 Tel.: (415) 373-1671  
7 Email: [aapton@zlk.com](mailto:aapton@zlk.com)  
8 [amccall@zlk.com](mailto:amccall@zlk.com)

9 *Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counsel for the Class*

10 [Additional Counsel on Signature Block]

11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
12 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

13 IN RE TESLA, INC. SECURITIES  
14 LITIGATION

15 Case No. 3:18-cv-04865-EMC

16 **PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO**  
17 **DEFENDANTS' SECOND EMERGENCY**  
18 **MOTION FOR DISCOVERY**

19 Defendants have no credible basis for seeking further discovery. In their first emergency  
20 motion, Defendants demanded supplemental expert reports and depositions from Professor Steve  
21 Heston and Dr. Michael Hartzmark after Plaintiff agreed (in response to Defendants' argument)  
22 to use "actual" option trading data in their damages calculation methodology. The Court granted  
23 Defendants' discovery motion in part and ordered a supplemental report and limited deposition  
24 from Professor Heston. Plaintiff not only complied with the Court's Order but went one step  
25 further in the spirit of compromise and efficiency and agreed to provide Defendants with a  
26 "sponsored" revised version of "Appendix 8" from Dr. Hartzmark.<sup>1</sup> The original version of  
27 "Appendix 8" was attached to Dr. Hartzmark's damages report dated November 10, 2021, and  
28 consisted of a table listing the artificial inflation and/or deflation in various option series. The  
revised version of "Appendix 8" provides the exact same information using "actual" option  
trading data instead of the previous "re-value fitted option values," as initially proposed by  
Defendants, agreed to by Plaintiff, and approved by the Court. Dr. Hartzmark's supplemental

1 A true and accurate copy of Defendants' request for a "sponsored" revised version of "Appendix 8" is attached hereto as Exhibit A (highlighted on page 7).

1 expert report merely attaches this revised “Appendix 8” and simply reiterates the basic subtraction  
 2 he used to calculate the values in the inflation/deflation column. Dr. Hartzmark’s methodology is  
 3 as it was when Plaintiff first served his expert report over one year ago; the *only* difference is the  
 4 incorporation of “actual” option trading data instead of the “re-fitted option values” that, as  
 5 repeatedly explained, Defendants suggested. It must be noted that Defendants have avoided  
 6 putting forward any methodology for the calculation of damages, and are once again pivoting 180  
 7 degrees in a misguided attempt to persuade the Court that no damages methodology is credible.  
 8 Even after Plaintiff has revised his damages calculation in the precise manner suggested by  
 9 Defendants, Defendants are not satisfied, but offer no alternative.

10 Defendants’ emergency motions have been, and are, meritless attempts to disrupt  
 11 Plaintiff’s trial preparation efforts. Dr. Hartzmark was *already* examined at length about  
 12 “Appendix 8” in its initial form. *See* Hartzmark Tr. 3/18/2022, pp. 290:6-317:20.<sup>2</sup> In fact,  
 13 Defendants questioned Dr. Hartzmark precisely on the topic of whether and how his options  
 14 damages methodology would function if Dr. Heston’s option values were changed, *e.g.*, from “re-  
 15 value fitted option values” to “actual” values. For example, Defendants questioned Dr. Hartzmark  
 16 as follows:

17 Q: Okay. And if Professor Heston’s model were determined to be unreliable, then  
 18 the information contained in your Appendix 8, likewise, would be unreliable  
 because it rests on his model; right?

19 MR. PORRITT: Object to form.

20 THE WITNESS: Well, to the extent that these values are replaced, say, for  
 21 example, with defendants’ values, then *the methodology and the out-of-pocket*  
*methodology to calculate damage would remain the same.* But I rely on Professor  
 22 Heston’s implied volatility. And given his standing in the industry, which is, you  
 23 know, unlike almost anyone else in academic finance and options pricing, I relied  
 24 on him much like I rely on, say, for example, Bloomberg prices and the models  
 25 associated with it. *The key here is the difference between the revalued and the*  
*but-for; in essence, the calculation of inflation.*

26 *Id.* at 298:15-299:11 (emphasis added).

---

27  
 28 <sup>2</sup> A true and accurate copy of the excerpt of Dr. Hartzmark’s deposition transcript is attached  
 hereto as Exhibit B.

1 Dr. Hartzmark's revised "Appendix 8" illustrates precisely what he testified to during his  
 2 deposition. Despite Defendants' constant refrain to the contrary, there is no new damages  
 3 methodology;<sup>3</sup> Dr. Hartzmark is continuing to apply the out-of-pocket methodology that he  
 4 described in his initial damages report served over a year ago. The only difference is that the but-  
 5 for price for stock options (which is being calculated in exactly the same way) is being subtracted  
 6 from actual, transacted prices instead of the previously used "re-fitted" option values. Once again,  
 7 this is a change *proposed by Defendants* that Plaintiff has accepted. Defendants have no legitimate  
 8 basis for re-examining him on what "Appendix 8" shows or renewing their *Daubert* motion on  
 9 the issue of option damages (which Defendants have already made clear they intend to do) when  
 10 all Dr. Hartzmark has done is adopt a change to the application of his methodology that  
 11 Defendants proposed themselves. Nothing new or material has come to light since the Court  
 12 denied Defendants' first request to obtain supplemental discovery from Dr. Hartzmark. Thus,  
 13 their renewed request for the same relief should similarly be denied.

14

15 Dated: January 4, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

16

17 **LEVI & KORSINSKY, LLP**

18

19 s/ Adam M. Apton20 Adam M. Apton (SBN 316506)  
 Adam C. McCall (SBN 302130)  
 75 Broadway, Suite 202  
 San Francisco, CA 94111  
 Tel.: (415) 373-1671  
 Email: aapton@zlk.com  
 Email: amccall@zlk.com

21

22

23

24

-and-

25

26

Nicholas I. Porritt  
 Elizabeth K. Tripodi  
 Alexander A. Krot III

27

28

---

<sup>3</sup> The comparison of a but-for price to actual transacted prices (*i.e.*, the approach being proposed now) was also described as a reasonable methodology in Professor Heston's initial report served on Defendants in November 2021.

1 LEVI & KORSINSKY, LLP  
2 1101 30th Street N.W., Suite 115  
3 Washington, D.C. 20007  
4 Tel.: (202) 524-4290  
5 Email: nporritt@zlk.com  
Email: etripodi@zlk.com  
Email: akrot@zlk.com  
(admitted *pro hac vice*)

6 -and-

7 Joseph Levi  
8 Eduard Korsinsky  
9 LEVI & KORSINSKY, LLP  
55 Broadway, 10th Floor  
New York, New York 10006  
Tel.: (212) 363-7500  
Email: jlevi@zlk.com  
Email: ek@zlk.com  
(admitted *pro hac vice*)

10  
11  
12  
13 *Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counsel for the Class*

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28